

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 25-27 stand rejected in the pending office action. Claims 1, 25, 26, and 27 are independent claims. The assignee traverses the rejections as to the pending claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The office action rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-19, 21-22, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0168055) in view of Hope (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0079125). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Hope and Janacek (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,248). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Hope and Bandini (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0169954). Claims 6 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Hope and Grimmer (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552). Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lord in view of Hope, Grimmer, and Janacek. The assignee respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose the subject matter of the rejected claims.

Claim 1 of the instant application is directed to a method for handling on a wireless mobile communication device a secure message to be sent from the wireless mobile communication device to a recipient. Claim 1 further recites performing a validity check with respect to using a security key associated with the recipient and, where a validity check issue exists, determining a reason for the validity check issue. The reason for the validity check issue is provided via a user interface on the mobile device.

In rejecting claim 1, the office action cites paragraph 46 of Hope as teaching claim 1's limitation that "*the reason for the validity check issue is provided via a user interface on the mobile device.*" Paragraph 46 of Hope reads:

[0046] When client 28 wishes to check the validity of a certificate, the client determines the identity or fingerprint of the CA or certificate issuer of the certificate in step 50. The client then creates a certificate status request to send to a DNS responder for determining the validity of the certificate in step 52. This request is then issued to the nearest approved DNS responder at step 54. The client can receive a list of responders known to be authoritative for certificate revocations for that CA in step 56. The client can also be informed as to the total number (T) of authoritative DNS responders available to query. The client then queries the first DNS responder in step 60. For purposes of this application, (N) is used to denote the next DNS responder to query. Therefore, for the first query to the first DNS responder, $N:=1$. If an authoritative response is not received in step 62, the client prepares to query the next DNS responder ($N:=N+1$) in step 64. If there are no more responders in step 66, the client can optionally perform the traditional verification in step 68. Based upon the outcome of that verification, the user can respond in the same manner as described below. If, in step 62, a determinative response has been received, there are two possible outcomes. In step 70, if a certificate revocation record is discovered, then the certificate has been revoked, but if the certificate revocation record is not discovered, the presumption is that the certificate is valid.

Paragraph 46 from Hope describes that a client can communicate with a remote server about a certificate. The office action also cites to paragraph 38 to explain its application of paragraph 46 to the recited claim language: "Hope 4: 0038 --Each entry contains a revocation date and optionally a reason the certificate was revoked."

Paragraph 38 from Hope describes that a remote server contains a revocation date and a "reason" the certificate was revoked. However, there is no disclosure in Hope that the "reason" (which is at the server as disclosed in paragraph 38) is provided in response to a client's request in paragraph 46, let alone being displayed on an interface to a user. This stands in stark contrast to what is required in claim 1, namely that the reason for the validity check issue is provided via a user interface on the mobile device. Because of this lack of teaching in Hope, claim 1 cannot

be rendered unpatentable based upon Hope (whether considered alone or in combination with the other cited references). Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

Assignee also respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable because the office action did not provide a basis of rejection with respect to the following limitation of claim 1: “*determining a reason for the validity check issue.*” Accordingly, assignee respectfully requests that either a basis of rejection for this limitation be provided or claim 1 be allowed because the cited references do not disclose this limitation.

The assignee also disagrees with other positions in the office action. For example, dependent claim 3 recites that the user of the mobile device is allowed to resolve the validity check issue (which is associated with using the security key), after which the secure message may be sent. In rejecting this claim, the office action cites to column 5, lines 60-65 of Janacek as disclosing the subject matter of claim 3. Column 5, lines 60-65 of Janacek reads as follows:

7. The system performs a syntax check of all of the recipient email addresses, ensuring that they are formed as per Internet SMTP email standards. If one or more invalid email addresses are detected, the Send operation is canceled; the system displays an error message and redisplay the message for the member to correct the problem.

This passage from Janacek describes allowing a user to correct an e-mail message syntax problem, but provides no teaching of resolving a validity check issue “associated with using the security key” as required by claim 3. For at least this additional reason, the subject matter of claim 3 is patentable over the cited references and should be allowed.

Independent claim 26 recites a wireless mobile communication device comprising a certificate store to store certificate data and means for using the stored certificate data to perform a validity check, wherein an issue exists due to the validity check and the reason for the issue is provided to the user of the mobile device. In rejecting claim 26, the office action cites paragraphs 290 and 291 of Lord as disclosing the following subject matter of claim 26: “*means*

for providing the reason for the validity check issue via a user interface of the mobile device.”

Paragraphs 290 and 291 of Lord read as follows:

[0290] AIM Client UI

[0291] The client UI for secure messaging clearly displays the status of the data that is received. In addition, it indicates the level of security that will be applied (or was applied) to outgoing messages. This information is indicated by using icons in the general portion of a conversation window, and on each message that is displayed.

These paragraphs of Lord describe displaying messaging status information and a level of security for outgoing messages. However, there is no disclosure that a “reason” is being provided to a user, let alone a “reason for the validity check issue” as required by claim 26. Because of this lack of teaching in Lord, claim 26 cannot be rendered unpatentable based upon Lord (whether considered alone or in combination with the other cited references). Accordingly, claim 26 is allowable and should proceed to issuance.

With respect to the remaining independent claims, the office action cited the same rationale in rejecting independent claims 25 and 27 that was cited in rejecting independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 25 and 27 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1 and should similarly proceed to issuance.

It is noted that the assignee has not provided arguments with respect to certain of the dependent claims in the instant application. This is done without prejudice to the assignee’s right to present arguments regarding each of the dependent claims at any point in the future. Further, because each of the dependent claims in the instant application depends from an independent claim that is patentable, the dependent claims are themselves patentable for at least the reasons set forth with respect to the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki

Reg. No. 40,511

JONES DAY

North Point; 901 Lakeside Avenue

Cleveland, OH 44114

(216) 586-3939